Crises in the Netherlands and Youths' Employment Chances

Educational- and ethnic inequality in youths' employment chances, the long-term effects of unemployment and inactivity at the beginning of a crisis, and the role of social ties and volunteering

ABSTRACT

Aim: Contributing to the literature on youth employment during crises by integrating educational- and ethnic inequality, social ties, previous employment status and volunteering. To give policy advice to prevent a low youth employment rate during the Covid-19 crisis, especially for low-educated and second-generation immigrant youths from Turkey and Morocco.

Data & Method: This research examines two waves (2008-2010 and 2013) from the Netherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study. These years correspond to the beginning and end of the financial crisis of 2008. The context of the financial crisis of 2008 can give lessons for youth employment during the Covid-19 crisis.

Findings: Youths' employment status at the beginning of the financial crisis was critical for their employment chances at the end of the financial crisis. Especially for second-generation immigrants from Turkey and Morocco, unemployment/inactivity had detrimental effects. Low-educated youths and second-generation immigrant youths from Turkey and Morocco were disadvantaged in their employment chances at the end of the financial crisis. However, educational attainment cannot explain the disadvantage of second-generation immigrants from Turkey and Morocco. Different social ties differ in their effects on employment chances: not all social ties affect youths' employment chances, some affect youths' employment chances positively, and others negatively. Also, the effect of some social ties differs by educational attainment. Volunteering at the beginning of the financial crisis enhanced inactive youths' employment chances at the end of the financial crisis enhanced inactive youths' employment chances at the end of the financial crisis enhanced inactive youths' employment chances at the end of the financial crisis enhanced inactive youths' employment chances at the end of the financial crisis. In contrast, for youths in general, volunteering does not affect employment status.

Policy implications: Taking the financial crisis as example, it is crucial to take measures to enhance youths' employment chances during the Covid-19 crisis. Especially for second-generation immigrants from Turkey and Morocco, unemployment and inactivity has long-term effects. Stimulating to continue learning in the educational system may be beneficial, but this is difficult or impossible for some youths. Furthermore, educational attainment is not necessarily beneficial for second-generation immigrants from Turkey and Morocco. This research shows indications of social inequality along several axes: migration, socioeconomic status, and spatial segregation. Experts on social inequality should be included in labour policy concerning youths in the Covid-19 crisis. Possible measures can be focused on expanding youths' social network. Lastly, volunteering does not enhance employment chances for everyone. Programs using volunteering as a pathway to employment should map the different groups in their programs and examine whether the approach fits the target group. Moreover, a personal approach is beneficial.



Ilse Zoon – 5481805

25-06-2021 - Thesis: MSc Sociology: Contemporary Social Problems Utrecht University 1st reader: Amy Nivette 2nd reader: Joris Beijers Wordcount: 10917



<u>Index</u>

Introduction
Theoretical framework4
Social ties4
Previous employment and a lost generation5
Volunteering
Educational inequality7
Ethnic penalty for Turkish and Moroccan second-generation immigrants9
Previous employment, volunteering, and the relation to educational- and ethnic inequality 9
Volunteering as informal qualification & job-search strategy for low-educated youths10
Volunteering as bridging social ties and integration signal10
Data & Method11
Data11
Research population12
Measurement12
Dependent variable
Independent variables
Interaction variables14
Control variables
Method15
Results
Descriptive analysis
Logistic regression analysis
H1: Social ties (T4; M1)
H2: Previous employment and lost generation (T4; M1)18
H3.1: Volunteering (T4; M1)18
H4.1: Educational inequality (T5; M1 & M3)20
H5.1 and H5.2: Ethnic penalty for second-generation immigrants from Turkey or Morocco (T6; M1, M8-M9)21
H6.1 and H6.2: Previous employment, volunteering, and the relation to educational- and ethnic inequality (T6; M10-M11)
H7.1: Volunteering as informal qualification & job-search strategy for low-educated youths (T7; M12-M13)
H7.2: Volunteering as bridging social ties and integration signal (T7: M14-M15)24
Control variables
Sensitivity analysis
Conclusion and discussion

Policy Advice: preventing a reduction in youths' employment chances during the	e Covid-19
crisis	31
References	
Appendix	41

Introduction

In times of economic disparity, youths' employment chances deteriorate. While youth unemployment is typically higher than general unemployment, it is disproportionately affected by crises (Choudhry, Marelli & Signorelli, 2012; Marelli, Choudhry & Signorelli, 2013; Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Parola, 2020; Kerckhoff, 2002; Schoon & Bynner, 2019). During the financial crisis of 2008, youths' employment rate in the Netherlands dropped 4,2 percentage points between 2008 and 2013 from 64,3% to 60,7%, while the general employment rate of people aged 15 through 64 dropped 1,4 percentage points from 74,9% to 73,6% (Eurostat, 2021). Furthermore, as a consequence of regulations regarding the Covid-19 crisis (De Nederlandsche Bank, 2021), that were first implemented in March 2020 within the Netherlands (Rijksoverheid, 2021a), youths' employment rate dropped by 2,8 percentage points between 2019 and 2020 from 65,3% to 62,5%, while the general employment rate dropped by 0,4 percentage points from 78,4% to 77,8% (Eurostat, 2021). Thus, both global crises led to disproportionately low youth employment rates.

Previous research and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) define youth by the age of 15 through 24 (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013; Steinberg, 2013; Gorry, 2013; OECD, 2021a). Concerning employment, there is an active and inactive labour force. Unemployment rates do not include the inactive labour force: the unemployed who are not job-seeking (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2021a), while employment rates include them (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2021b; Lancee, 2012). This research is concerned with youths' employment rate.

Not having employment is problematic for youths in multiple life domains. Besides the financial function, Jahoda (1981, 1982, 1997) argues that employment has latent functions corresponding to basic human needs directly related to well-being and mental health. Namely, time structure, collective purpose, social contact, status, and activity (Paul & Batinic, 2009). Additionally, researchers speak of a risk of a lost generation during crises, since not being employed has long-term effects as decreasing employability (Marelli et al., 2013), reduced earnings over a lifetime (Marelli et al., 2013; Steinberg, 2013), lower job quality, and precarious employment (Marelli et al., 2013). Low youth employment rates have consequences for society as well: less social cohesion (OECD, 2006) and economic productivity losses (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Steinberg, 2013; Marelli et al., 2013; Choudhry et al., 2012).

Factors related to individuals' employment chances are social ties, previous employment and volunteering. Firstly, social ties provide information, influence (Kanas & van

Tubergen, 2009; Strauß, 2008) and support (Brook, 2005), positively affecting employment chances. Secondly, unemployment/inactivity has long-term consequences concerning employment chances because it causes losses in human (Marelli et al., 2013; Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Becker, 1975) and social capital (Brucker, 2015; Brook, 2005), and unemployment can lead to experiences of failure (Paul & Batinic, 2009). Thirdly, volunteering can increase human and social capital (Baert & Vujić, 2018), enhancing employment chances (Garrouste, Kozovska & Arjona Perez, 2010). Even when volunteering does not increase human and social capital, it can signal beneficial characteristics to employers (Baert & Vujić, 2018). Volunteering is part of various programmes to activate welfare recipients, ultimately leading to employment (Bouwman-van 't Veer, Konijn & Berkel, 2011; A Bunch Of Choices, 2020). Previous research finds that volunteering programmes do not directly translate into paid work for everyone but do not specifically observe the effect for youths (Kamerade & Ellis Paine, 2014; Bouwman-van 't Veer et al., 2011). Youths may benefit from enhancing human capital by volunteering because they have low generic and job-specific work experience (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013).

Vulnerable youths in crisis are low-educated and second-generation immigrants (SGIs) from Turkey and Morocco. They are more likely to be unemployed and inactive and have a lower occupational status than high-educated youths and natives (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Hannan, Hövels, van den Berg & White, 1995; Shavit & Muller, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste et al., 2010; Temple, 2000; Gracia, Vazquez & van de Werfhorst, 2014; Tesser & Dronkers, 2007). Crisis increases this disadvantage (Rijksoverheid, 2021b; Central Bureau of Statistics, 2021c).

Since the 1960s, Western societies show an educational expansion trend (Solga, 2008). In the Netherlands, youths aged between 15 and 27 without a start qualification decreased by 9,9 percentage points between 2003 (35%) and 2013 (25,1%) (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2021c). In the context of low labour demand and educational expansion, low-educated youths have fewer employment chances due to high-educated youths outqualifying and displacing them and employers valuing their productivity negatively. Also, low-educated youths are stigmatised, leading to self-exclusion, and they have fewer valuable social ties than high-educated youths (Solga, 2008).

Immigration from Morocco and Turkey started in the 1960s for employment in lowskilled jobs. Both immigrant groups were low-educated compared to the Dutch population and typically not fluent in the Dutch language for long (Gracia et al., 2014; Crul & Doomernik, 2003; Driessen & Smit, 2007; Tesser & Dronkers, 2007). SGIs are higher educated than their parents but still lower than natives (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2016; Rezai, 2017). Previous research shows that low-educational attainment explains part of the disadvantage, but even when controlling for educational attainment, SGIs are disadvantaged (Crul & Doomernik, 2003; Tesser & Dronkers, 2007; van Tubergen & van de Werfhorst, 2007; Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Gracia et al., 2014).

Low-educated and SGI youths are disadvantaged in employment chances. Thus, previous employment status could explain their disadvantage over time (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Ianelli & Duta, 2018; Hannan et al., 1995; Shavit & Muller, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste et al., 2010; Tesser & Dronkers, 2007; Gracia et al., 2014). Furthermore, Strauß (2008) found that low-educated youths and non-Western immigrants less often volunteer than high-educated youths and natives (Strauß, 2008), which could explain their disadvantage.

Lastly, there are reasons to believe that the effect of volunteering differs by educational attainment and immigrant status. Volunteering may be beneficial for qualification and jobsearch methods, especially in lower labour market segments which consist primarily of loweducated youths (Strauß, 2008). For SGIs, volunteering can enhance social capital outside their community and signal integration (Baert & Vujić, 2016).

This research contributes to the youth employment literature by integrating educationaland ethnic inequality, social ties, previous employment status and volunteering. Aiming to give policy advice to prevent a low youth employment rate during the Covid-19 crisis, especially for low-educated and SGI youths.

Two waves of longitudinal panel data of the Netherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELSS) (de Graaf, Kalmijn, Kraaykamp & Monden, 2010; Tolsma, Kraaykamp, de Graaf, Kalmijn & Monden, 2014) are examined. Data for the first wave was obtained between 2008 and 2010 (de Graaf et al., 2010), and the second wave in 2013 (Tolsma et al., 2014). The financial crisis started in 2008, and previous research shows lagged effects of crises on employment rates that can persist for up to five years (Choudhry et al., 2012). Meaning that wave two was conducted during the end-stage of the financial crisis. This timing is helpful to draw lessons on youth employment from the financial crises causing a reduction in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), resulting in low youth employment (Choudhry et al., 2012; WSO, 2021; de Nederlandsche Bank, 2021). The data is examined to answer the following research questions:

- 1. To what extent do social ties, previous employment status, volunteering, educational attainment, and being SGI from Turkey or Morocco affect youths' employment status in 2013?
- 2. To what extent can previous employment status and volunteering explain the positive effect of educational attainment on youths' employment status in 2013?
- 3. To what extent can educational attainment, previous employment status, and volunteering explain the negative effect of being SGI from Turkey or Morocco on youths' employment status in 2013?
- 4. How can a reduction in youths' employment rate, especially of low-educated youths and SGIs from Turkey and Morocco, be prevented during crises?

Theoretical framework

This chapter gives a theoretical answer to the research questions. The first part of the theoretical chapter explains the effects of social ties, previous employment status and volunteering on the employment chances of youths in general, while the second part specifies educational- and ethnic differences.

Social ties

The effect of one's social ties on employment chances derives from social capital theory (Granovetter, 1983). According to social capital theory, one's social ties affect labour market outcomes because they provide valuable resources (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993; Lancee, 2012; Strauß, 2008; Coleman, 1988) in the form of information, influence (Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Strauß, 2008) and support (Brook, 2005). Firstly, social ties facilitate information flows for job-seekers and employers: either by acquiring information on a job or a potential employee (Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Strauß, 2008) or signalling social credentials to employers (Strauß, 2008). Secondly, social ties can influence actors who play a critical role in the hiring process (Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Strauß, 2008). Thirdly, social ties provide support by noticing youths' abilities and demonstrating the belief that the student can accomplish success (Rezai, 2017). Empirically, Brucker found that individuals with a disability and low levels of social capital, who thus have less frequent contact with people than individuals with high levels of social capital, are more likely to be inactive at the labour market (Brucker, 2015). There is assumed that having more frequent contact with social ties implicates that one's social network is more extensive (Tubergen & Volker, 2015) and thus provides more information, influence and support.

H1: Having more frequent contact with social ties positively affects youths' employment status in 2013 versus having less contact with social ties.

Previous employment and a lost generation

Human capital theory argues that employment enhances productivity by work experience and skills (Becker, 1975). Thus, not having employment is a loss of human capital (Marelli et al., 2013; Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Becker, 1975). Work experience is attractive for employers because they can potentially invest less in training while periods without employment are less attractive (Garrouste et al., 2010).

Employment also enhances one's social network with other employed people (Brucker, 2015; Brook, 2005). Furthermore, the group that on average holds most valuable resources which lead to employment are employed people (Strauß, 2008; Brook, 2005).

Besides the loss of human and social capital for not employed youths (whether active or inactive), unemployment (only for active youths) may translate to experiences of failure. Paul & Batinic (2009) found that one's sense of status does not differ between employed and inactive people. However, unemployment negatively affects one's sense of status, indicating that the unemployed form a specific group suffering from stigmatisation. Attitudes towards unemployment have been negative throughout history (Ibid.). Stigmatisation can lead to youths excluding themselves from the labour market (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013; Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008).

Additionally, previous research finds that inactivity/unemployment has scarring effects beyond future wages and employability, on happiness, job satisfaction and health, many years later. This increases the risk of a lost generation during crisis when youth employment rates are low (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013; Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Scarpetta, Sonnet & Manfredi, 2010).

H2: Inactivity and unemployment in 2008-2010 negatively affect youths' employment status in 2013 versus employment in 2008-2010.

Volunteering

Theoretically, volunteering may affect employment chances in three ways: human capital, social capital and employer preferences (Baert & Vujić, 2018). Firstly, volunteering can enhance human capital by acquiring skills and experience (Baert & Vujić, 2018), and potentially having fewer investments in training is attractive for employers (Garrouste et al.,

2010). Secondly, social network theory (Granovetter, 1974) states that people may expand their network during volunteer work, which can help them find a job more quickly (Sauer, 2015; Brook, 2005). Also, being socially engaged decreases the chance of becoming inactive in the labour market (Brook, 2005). Lastly, volunteering affects employers' hiring decisions, even when it does not affect human and social capital. Based on Becker's (1957) taste-based discrimination model, employers prefer (not) to hire somebody with volunteering activities, just because these employers, their co-workers or customers experience a certain (dis)utility from working together with volunteers (Baert & Vujić, 2018). Based on Arrow's (1973) statistical discrimination model, employers use volunteering activities on resumés to screen and sort job seekers according to abilities that are yet unobserved: social engagement is related to personality traits such as emotional stability, extraversion and openness, which enhance individual productivity and team performance (Baert & Vujić, 2018; Bekkers, 2005; Borghans, ter Weel & Weinberg, 2008; Heineck, 2011; OECD, 2015).

Empirical results show that volunteering positively affects employment status (Strauß, 2008; Baert & Vujić, 2018; Brook, 2005). Baert & Vujić (2018) conducted a field experiment in Belgium. Volunteering activities were randomly assigned to fictitious job applications and sent to genuine vacancies. They find that volunteers are 7,3% more likely to get a positive reaction than non-volunteers (Baert & Vujić, 2018). Strauß (2008) did comparative longitudinal research on volunteering in Germany and Great Britain. She finds that volunteers are more likely to find new employment than non-volunteers (Strauß, 2008). Engagement in volunteering also lowers the likelihood of becoming inactive in the labour market (Brook, 2005).

H3.1: Volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 positively affects youths' employment status in 2013 versus non-volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013.

Volunteering as a pathway to employment for unemployed and inactive youths

Theoretically, since unemployed and inactive youths lose human and social capital (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013; Becker, 1975; Garrouste et al., 2010) and volunteering can enhance human and social capital (Baert & Vujić, 2018; Sauer, 2015; Brook, 2005), the expectation is that volunteering is beneficial for the employment chances of unemployed and inactive youths. Previous research shows that volunteering programmes for welfare recipients differ in their effects and differ for different groups, but they did not examine youths in specific (Kamerade & Ellis Paine, 2014; Bouwman-van 't Veer et al., 2011). Youths may benefit from

enhancing their human capital with experience since the high youth unemployment rate compared to the older labour force can be partially explained by youths' lower generic and job-specific work experience (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013).

H3.2: Unemployment and inactivity in 2008-2010 have a stronger negative effect on employment status in 2013 for non-volunteers in 2008-2010 than for volunteers in 2008-2010.

Educational inequality

The displacement, discredit, and stigmatisation argument explain the labour market vulnerability of low-educated in the context of educational expansion and low labour demand (Solga, 2008). The displacement argument derives from microeconomic theories like human capital (Becker, 1975), signalling (Spence, 1974; Stiglitz, 1975), and job competition/vacancy chains (Thurow, 1975, 1979; Sørensen, 1977; Sørensen & Kalleberg, 1981). According to human capital theory, education enhances skills and knowledge, and therefore the productivity of individuals (Becker, 1975; Tan, 2014). Moreover, employers rationally hire youths based on their human capital (Gracia et al., 2014). Even when productivity is not enhanced, being a good student signals various characteristics to employers (Temple, 2002; Shavit & Muller, 2000): hard-working, disciplined, intelligent and fast learners of new skills. Additionally, vocational qualifications are likely to signal that one has a low aptitude or is a troublemaker (Shavit & Muller, 2000). In times of increased job competition (Solga, 2008), as is the case during the financial crisis and Covid-19 crisis (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013; Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Parola, 2020; Kerckhoff, 2002; Schoon & Bynner, 2019; De Nederlandsche Bank, 2021), there is an oversupply of high-educated youths. Therefore, high-educated youths enter into lower-skilled jobs, displacing low-educated youths from their previously available jobs leading to unemployment.

The discredit argument holds that employers are unlikely to hire low-skilled youths, even in labour supply shortages. Employers negatively value the skills and productivity of low-skilled youths because they are a social minority, increasing the risk for low-skilled youths, e.g. youths without start qualification, to being excluded from applicants' queues and thus the risk of unemployment (Solga, 2008).

The stigmatisation argument holds that educational expansion increased experiences of failure in low-educated youths' educational and biographical sphere because most of their generation have success in their educational career. Low education has become a discrediting, stigmatising attribute of individuals because of its' increasing visibility, the increasing belief

that educational attainment and failure are within the control of individuals, and the increasing importance accorded to educational attainment in modern societies (Ibid.; Brown, 1996; Brewer & Brown, 1998; Fiske, 1998). Educational attainment is salient in many life domains, and being low-educated becomes a master status in one's life (Goffman, 1963). As a result, low-educated youths may give up hope of a recognised career and disidentify with employment goals for fear of humiliation and unfavourable reactions (Solga, 2008).

Empirical research shows that education lowers both the chance of unemployment (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Hannan et al., 1995; Shavit & Muller, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste et al., 2010) and becoming inactive at the labour market (Temple, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste, Kozovska & Arjona Perez, 2010).

H4.1: Having a higher obtained level of education positively affects youths' employment status in 2013 versus having a lower obtained level of education.

Social ties and the relation to educational inequality

The impoverished network resources argument holds that educational attainment influences job-searching and application processes because it affects the value of social ties (Solga, 2008). Based on cultural capital theory (Boudon, 1974; Bourdieu, 1986, de Graaf, de Graaf & Kraaykamp, 2000), children's average level of demonstrated academic ability is related to their class origin. Moreover, the educational system rewards proper behaviour and compliance with cultural values, influencing youths' ambition and educational choices that children and their parents make (Solga, 2002). Because of educational expansion, the social composition of low-educated is selective in terms of social background (Solga, 2002, 2008), and educational groups structurally differ in available contacts (Solga, 2008). According to network theory (Granovetter, 1983), socially stratified recruitment and supply networks determine individuals' job-search patterns (Solga, 2008). As a result, low-educated youths have fewer connections to employed ties than high-educated youths and, if connected, have fewer connections to qualified jobs (Ibid.). Subsequently, these youths know less about where, when and how to apply (Wial, 1991). Based on this, the expectation is that low-educated youths' social ties are less valuable for employment than high-educated youths' social ties.

H4.2: A higher frequency of contact with social ties has a stronger positive effect on employment status in 2013 for high-educated than for low-educated youths.

Ethnic penalty for Turkish and Moroccan second-generation immigrants

Empirical results have shown that Moroccan and Turkish SGIs are disadvantaged in the Dutch labour market (Tesser & Dronkers, 2007; Gracia et al., 2014). Tesser & Dronkers (2007) found that SGIs from Turkey and Morocco were more likely to be unemployed between 1988 and 1998 than natives. Gracia et al. (2014) found that in 2008-2010 the employment participation of Turkish and Moroccan SGIs was lower than for natives. A lack of resources of SGIs mainly explains ethnic inequality, and educational attainment is most prominent in explanations (Crul & Doomernik, 2003; Gracia et al., 2014; Tesser & Dronkers, 2007). SGIs are mobilising upwards: they are higher educated than their parents, but they are still lower educated than native youths (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2016, 2020a; Rezai, 2017), and lower educational attainment negatively affects employment chances (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Hannan et al., 1995; Shavit & Muller, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste et al., 2010; Temple, 2000). An ethnic penalty refers to the disadvantage SGIs experience after controlling for educational attainment (Falcke, 2017; Kalter & Kogan, 2006; van Tubergen & van de Werfhorst, 2007; Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Gracia et al., 2014). Gracia et al. (2014) found that controlling for educational attainment even increases the disadvantage. However, they did not focus on the youngest cohort aged 15-24.

H5.1: Being SGI from Turkey or Morocco negatively affects youths' employment status in 2013 versus being native.

H5.2: Differences in educational attainment *partly* explain the negative effect of being SGI from Turkey or Morocco on youths' employment status in 2013.

Previous employment, volunteering, and the relation to educational- and ethnic inequality

Low-educated youths and SGIs from Turkey and Morocco participate less in employment than high-educated youths and natives (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Ianelli & Duta, 2018; Hannan et al., 1995; Shavit & Muller, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste et al., 2010; Tesser & Dronkers, 2007; Gracia et al., 2014). Therefore, the expectation is that differences in employment status at the beginning of the financial crisis partly explain the disadvantage of low-educated youths and SGIs at the end of the financial crisis.

H6.1: Differences in employment status in 2008-2010 *partly* explain the positive effect of educational attainment and the negative effect of being SGI from Turkey or Morocco on youths' employment status in 2013.

Strauß (2008) found that in both Germany and Great Britain, immigrants and low-educated people are less likely to volunteer compared to natives and high-educated people. Therefore, the expectation is that differences in volunteering activities explain part of educational- and ethnic inequality.

H6.2: Differences in volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 *partly* explain the positive effect of educational attainment and the negative effect of being SGI from Turkey or Morocco on youths' employment status in 2013.

Volunteering as informal qualification & job-search strategy for low-educated youths

Theoretically, the effect of volunteering may differ by educational attainment and immigrant status. The expectation is that volunteering serves as informal qualification and job-searching strategy in non-standard employment relationships because employees in these relationships profit less from labour market protection than core workers. Since low-educated people dominate those labour market segments, low-educated people who volunteer should use it for qualification and job-search (Strauß, 2008). Also, volunteering can enhance human and social capital (Baert & Vujić, 2018; Sauer, 2015; Brook, 2005), which is what low-educated youths have less than high-educated youths (Solga, 2008; Becker, 1975; Tan, 2014). Strauß (2008) found that volunteering affects employment status greatest for the low-educated in Germany and Great Britain, but this effect was non-significant.

H7.1: Volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 has a stronger positive effect on employment status in 2013 for low-educated youths than for high-educated youths.

Volunteering as bridging social ties and integration signal

For SGIs, volunteering can enhance their social network outside their community (Baert & Vujić, 2016). Crul & Doomernik (2003) find that Turkish and Moroccan (but mostly Turkish) SGIs predominantly contact their community. Thus, volunteering can benefit their employment chances (Baert & Vujić, 2016) by providing bridging social ties, which are valuable social resources providing new information and influence (Lancee, 2012). Additionally, volunteering

may signal better integration to employers (Handy & Greenspan, 2009; Baert & Vujić, 2016). Baert & Vujić (2016) conducted a field experiment on the effect of resumés with volunteering activities on the likelihood of getting an invitation for job interviews while differentiating by ethnicity. They find that while non-volunteering natives receive more than twice as many job interview invitations than non-volunteering immigrants, no unequal treatment is found between natives and immigrants when they reveal volunteer activities (Ibid.).

H7.2: Volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 has a stronger positive effect on employment status in 2013 for SGIs from Turkey or Morocco than for natives.

Data & Method

Data

This research uses data from the first and second wave of the NELLS (de Graaf et al., 2010; Tolsma et al., 2014). It contains panel survey data with questionnaires conducted at two points in time. Between December 2008 and May 2010 (de Graaf et al., 2010), and February 2013 and December 2013 (Tolsma et al., 2014). The questionnaire consisted of two parts during wave 1 (W1): a face-to-face interview and a self-completion questionnaire. Before the fieldwork, 100 Turks, 100 Moroccans, and 100 other inhabitants of the Netherlands tested the interviews. They found the survey interesting, but some mentioned it took time to complete the questionnaire. The reliability of the scales was proved satisfactory (De Graaf et al., 2010). The fieldwork of wave 2 (W2) uses a mixed-mode: 75% of respondents were informed to complete the questionnaire online, and 25% were informed that an interviewer would visit (Tolsma et al., 2014).

For W1, two-stage stratified sampling was used: (1) a quasi-random selection of 35 municipalities by region and urbanisation, and (2) a random selection from the population registry by age and ethnicity. The selection of municipalities was quasi-random because the four big cities were included (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Den Haag and Utrecht) to have a representative sample of Moroccans and Turks. 5312 respondents participated: 1143 Turks (response rate: 50%), 1192 Moroccans (response rate: 46%), and 2977 others (response rate: 56%). Of the group others, 2556 were Dutch natives (de Graaf et al., 2010). After participating in 2008-2010, respondents with complete information (i.e. when information from the face-to-face and self-completion form was available) (N=4456) were contacted to participate in W2. 2829 respondents participated: 452 Turks (response rate: 65%), 431 Moroccans (response rate: 62%), 1717 Dutch natives (response rate: 83%), and 229 others (response rate: 76%). The

average response rate was 75% (Tolsma et al., 2014). The data was anonymised so answers cannot trace to individuals (de Graaf et al., 2010).

This dataset is helpful for this research. It contains data measured at two points in time during the financial crisis, relevant questions regarding social ties, employment, volunteering, and educational attainment, and the sample of immigrants from Turkey and Morocco is representative (Tolsma et al., 2014; de Graaf et al., 2010). However, the dataset also has disadvantages. Firstly, it does not measure employment status the same in 2013 and 2008-2010. In 2008-2010, the survey asked whether one was searching for a job (De Graaf et al., 2010), but not in 2013 (Tolsma et al., 2014): differentiating between unemployment and inactivity in 2013 is impossible. This is an empirical limitation because the characteristics of voluntary unemployed youths may differ from involuntarily unemployed youths (Strauß, 2008). Secondly, Moroccans' and Turks' response rate was low compared to the reference group, which can cause a bias (De Graaf et al., 2010; Tolsma et al., 2014). Thirdly, 7,7% of the sample of W1 has missing values on the self-completion questionnaire due to a flaw in the fieldwork strategy (De Graaf et al., 2010).

Research population

The research population consists of Dutch natives and Turkish and Moroccan SGIs. SGI is operationalised as Gracia et al. (2014) did: respondents with only one parent born in Turkey or Morocco, or a combination of both countries are excluded from the sample to have a clear differentiation between the ethnic groups. One is defined as native when both parents are born in the Netherlands (de Graaf et al., 2010). Only people aged 15-24 in W1 are included. The age of W1 is used because only people aged 15-45 participated in W1 (de Graaf et al., 2010), meaning that no one was 15 in W2. This leaves a sample of 619. After excluding respondents with missing values, the sample is reduced by 1,45% to N=610.

Measurement

Dependent variable

The dependent variable is a dummy variable measuring whether one is employed (yes/no) in 2013 based on two items. First, whether the respondent has a paid job or not. Full-time students did not answer this item. Second, one's primary source of income. The categories range from income from labour or an owned enterprise to no own income. In between were categories on benefits. These two items are recoded, so the variable *employed in 2013* indicates whether one has a paid job, or his/her primary source of income is from labour or an owned enterprise (1),

or not (0). When one indicated to have a paid job and receive a benefit, one was coded as employed.

Independent variables

Social ties

The survey contains four social ties: family, friends, colleagues or fellow students, and neighbours. The items indicate the frequency of personal contact: physical contact, not calling, texting or something similar: ranging from 1-7 ((almost) every day-never). These items are recoded to a scale from 0-6 (never-(almost) every day). When one does not have this person, the variable is coded as 0. The range with seven categories is used because other research uses this range (Tubergen & Volker, 2015). The Cronbach's Alpha of the four items is poor (0,594), so they are not merged into one variable on social ties.

Employment status in 2008-2010

Two dummy variables measure employment status in 2008-2010: *inactive (2008-2010)* and *unemployed (2008-2010)* (ref.: employed (2008-2010)) based on four items. First, whether one ever had a paid job since leaving full-time education (yes/no). If answered as no, the following two items were missing. Second, whether one had always worked since their first paid job (yes/no). The next item was missing when answered as yes. Third, whether one had a paid job or self-employment at the survey moment (yes/no). Fourth, whether one searched for a job at the survey moment (yes/no). *Inactive (2008-2010)* indicates 1 for unemployed non-job-seeking respondents, and 0 when one searched for a job or was employed. *Unemployed (2008-2010)* indicates 1 for unemployed job-seeking respondents, and 0 when one searched for a job or was employed.

Volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013

The survey contains items on volunteering for sports associations/clubs, other associations/clubs and outside of associations/clubs. Multiple items construct the dummy variables *volunteering (2008-2010)* (ref.: non-volunteering in 2008-2010) and *volunteering (2013)* (ref.: non-volunteering in 2013). First, how often one practices various sports categories. If answered as never for all categories, the following item is missing. Second, where one practices the most often practised sport. If answered as not at an organisation, the following item is missing. Third, whether one volunteers at the association or club where they practice the sport (yes/no). The items are similar for other associations or clubs, but the queue starts

with the second item and indicates whether one is a member of seven association/club categories. If answered no on a category, the following item (whether one volunteers at this association/club) is missing. Whether one volunteers outside of associations and clubs is one item indicating yes/no. The items are the same in W1 and W2, and for each wave, the items are merged into one variable indicating whether one volunteers on at least one category (1) or not (0).

Educational attainment

One ordinal variable treated as a continuous variable measures educational attainment. One item of W2 indicates one's highest obtained level of education. Educational attainment of W2 is used because it is a better predictor for employment status in W2 than one's previous educational attainment. The categories range from 1-10 (primary education-university (master/doctoral)), and no education as a separate category. Youths without start qualification are defined as youths who have not completed medium- or higher general education (havo or vwo) or lower vocational education (at least mbo2) (Rijksoverheid, 2021b; Central Bureau of Statistics, 2021d). Therefore, no education, primary education or lower vocational education (vmbo) is coded as 0. The survey does not differentiate between mbo1 and mbo2. Therefore, the variable is recoded to a range from 0-6 as follows: (0) no education, primary education or lower vocational education (vmbo), (1) lower vocational education (mbo1/mbo2 bol/bbl), (2) medium general education (havo), (3) higher general education (vwo/gymnasium), (4) medium vocational education (mbo3/mbo4 bol/bbl), (5) higher vocational education (hbo), and (6) university bachelor/master/doctoral.

Second-generation immigrant from Turkey or Morocco

The survey contains a variable that indicates one's ethnic origin based on the self-reported country of birth of the respondent and both parents of the respondent. This item is recoded to a dummy variable which indicates whether one is SGI with both parents from Morocco or Turkey (ref.: native).

Interaction variables

Two interaction variables are computed to test H3.2: *inactive* (2008-2010)*volunteering (2008-2010), and *unemployed* (2008-2010)*volunteering (2008-2010). Four interaction variables are computed to test H4.2: *education*family*, *education*friends*, *education*colleagues/students*, and *education*neighbours*. Two interaction variables are computed to test H7.1: volunteering

(2008-2010)*education, and volunteering (2013)*education. Finally, two interaction variables are computed to test H7.2: volunteering (2008-2010)*SGI, and volunteering (2013)*SGI.

Control variables

All models control for age, currently in full-time education, children, and female. Age is an interval variable indicating one's age at the survey moment. According to Kerckhoff (2002), age is necessary to consider: age is a salient factor in opportunities provided for young people in school and the labour market, and age influences decisions young people make during the period of transition (Kerckhoff, 2002). The expectation is that age affects employment status in 2013 positively. *Currently in full-time education* is computed as dummy variable indicating whether one was in full-time education in 2013 (yes(1)/no(0)). Moro-Egido & Panades (2010) found that only 40% of students had paid employment throughout their whole degree: the expectation is that being a full-time student negatively affects employment status in 2013. *Children* is computed as dummy variable indicating whether one had no children (0) or at least one child (1) in 2013. Previous research shows that employment decreases after having children (Vlasblom & Schippers, 2006): the expectation is that having children negatively affects employment status in 2013. Female is a dummy variable indicating whether one is female (1) or male (0). Since women are more likely to exclude themselves from the labour market after having children than males (Ibid.), the models control for being female. The expectation is that being female negatively affects employment status in 2013.

Method

Multivariate logistic regressions test the hypotheses. The data meet assumptions for logistic regressions (Statistics Solutions, 2021). First, the dependent variable is dichotomous. Second, the observations are not from repeated measurements or matched data. Third, there is no multicollinearity: the Variance Inflation Factor is highest for age at 1,7, which is no severe correlation (Zach, 2019). Fourth, most continuous variables are linearly related to the log odds (checked by the Box-Tidwell method). Age (p<0,01), social ties: colleagues/students (p<0,01), education*colleagues/students social ties: neighbours (p<0,01), (p<0,05), and education*neighbours (p<0,01) show significance and are therefore not linearly related to the log odds. Whether this influences the results will be checked by a sensitivity analysis. Fifth, the sample size is large enough (N=610).

Fifteen models test the hypotheses (see table 1 (T1)): M1 includes all independent variables, M2 adds the two interaction variables of previous employment status with volunteering in 2008-2010, M3 includes only *educational attainment*, M4-M7 include all independent variables and one of the four interaction variables of education with social ties, M8 includes only *SGI*, M9 adds *educational attainment*, M10 adds the variables on previous employment, M11 excludes those and adds the variables on volunteering, M12 includes all independent variables and *volunteering (2008-2010)*education*, M13 replaces that by *volunteering (2013)*education*, M14 replaces that by *volunteering (2008-2010)*SGI*, and M15 replaces that by *volunteering (2013)*SGI*.

	Table 1: Hypotheses by model	
Hyp	oothesis	Model
1	Having more frequent contact with social ties positively affects youths' employment status in 2013 versus having less contact with social ties.	1
2	Inactivity and unemployment in 2008-2010 negatively affect youths' employment status in 2013 versus employment in 2008-2010.	1
3.1	Volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 positively affects youths' employment status in 2013 versus non-volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013.	1
3.2	Unemployment and inactivity in 2008-2010 have a stronger negative effect on employment status in 2013 for non-volunteers in 2008-2010 than for	2
	volunteers in 2008-2010.	
4.1	Having a higher obtained level of education positively affects youths' employment status in 2013 versus having a lower obtained level of education.	1&3
4.2	A higher frequency of contact with social ties has a stronger positive effect on employment status in 2013 for high-educated than for low-educated youths.	4-7
5.1	Being SGI from Turkey or Morocco negatively affects youths' employment status in 2013 versus being native.	1 & 8
5.2	Differences in educational attainment partly explain the negative effect of being SGI from Turkey or Morocco on youths' employment status in 2013.	9
6.1	Differences in employment status in 2008-2010 partly explain the positive effect of educational attainment and the negative effect of being SGI from	10
	Turkey or Morocco on youths' employment status in 2013.	
6.2	Differences in volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 partly explain the positive effect of educational attainment and the negative effect of being SGI from	11
	Turkey or Morocco on youths' employment status in 2013.	
7.1	Volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 has a stronger positive effect on employment status in 2013 for low-educated youths than for high-educated youths.	12 & 13
7.2	Volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 has a stronger positive effect on employment status in 2013 for SGIs from Turkey or Morocco than for natives.	14 & 15

Results

Descriptive analysis

T2 shows the descriptive statistics. 70% of youths in the dataset was employed in 2013, while 66,2% was employed in 2008-2010. In 2008-2010, 23% of youths were inactive, and 10,8% was unemployed. On average, youths in the dataset obtained an educational level of 3,061 on a scale from 0-6. This lies between higher general education and medium vocational education. 28,7% of youths in the dataset are SGIs from Turkey or Morocco. 32,8% volunteered in 2008-2010, while 33,1% volunteered in 2013. Youths in the dataset have the most frequent contact with friends, followed by family, colleagues/students, and lastly by neighbours. They are aged between 19 and 30 in 2013 with an average of 23. 44,1% was in full-time education in 2013, 12,8% has at least one child, and 53,4% is female.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics										
	Ν	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation					
Employed in 2013	610	0	1	0,700	0,459					
Educational attainment	610	0	6	3,061	1,950					
SGI from Turkey or Morocco	610	0	1	0,287	0,453					
Employment status in 2008-2010										
Employed in 2008-2010	610	0	1	0,662	0,473					
Inactive in 2008-2010	610	0	1	0,230	0,421					
Unemployed in 2008-2010	610	0	1	0,108	0,311					
Volunteering										
Volunteering in 2008-2010	610	0	1	0,328	0,470					
Volunteering in 2013	610	0	1	0,331	0,471					
Social ties										
Frequency of contact with family	610	0	6	4,857	1,247					
Frequency of contact with friends	610	0	6	4,962	0,949					
Frequency of contact with colleagues/students	610	0	6	3,813	1,858					
Frequency of contact with neighbours	610	0	6	3,567	1,875					
Age	610	19,425	30,190	23,463	2,659					
Currently in fulltime education	610	0	1	0,441	0,497					
Children	610	0	1	0,128	0,334					
Female	610	0	1	0,534	0,499					
Valid N (listwise)	610									

T3 shows the correlation matrix. The strongest correlating variables are currently in full-time education and age (r=-0,485 p<0,001). When looking at the correlations with the dependent variable, currently in fulltime education has the greatest significant negative correlation (r=-0,298 p<0,001), followed by SGIs from Turkey or Morocco (r=-0,186 p<0,001), inactive (2008-2010) (r=-0,170 p<0,001) and unemployed (2008-2010) (r=-0,129 p<0,01). Age has the biggest significant positive correlation (r=0,208 p<0,001), followed by educational attainment (r=0,175 p<0,001). Thus, when in isolation of other factors, this is the effect of the variables on employment status. The effects are in the expected direction.

				Tabl	e 3: Corr	elations									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Employed in 2013	1														
2. Educational attainment	,175***	1													
3. SGI from Turkey or Morocco	-,186***	-,133**	1												
4. Inactive in 2008-2010	-,170***	-,119**	,240***	1											
5. Unemployed in 2008-2010	-,129**	-0,054	,152***	-,190***	1										
6. Volunteering in 2008-2010	0,053	,147***	-,204***	-0,016	-0,063	1									
7. Volunteering in 2013	0,012	,119**	-,123**	-0,036	-,088*	,421***	1								
8. Frequency of contact with family	-0,026	-,150***	,247***	0,044	0,031	-0,052	-0,001	1							
9. Frequency of contact with friends	-0,041	-,158***	0,075	0,038	,086*	0,02	0,057	,315***	1						
10. Frequency of contact with colleagues/students	0,077	-0,037	,126**	,082*	0,004	-0,009	0,003	,259***	,363***	1					
11. Frequency of contact with neighbours	-0,04	-,145***	,152***	0,03	-0,032	,087*	,127**	,269***	,263***	,312***	1				
12. Age	,208***	,358***	-,183***	-,227***	-,106**	0,064	-0,026	-,208***	-,249***	-,222***	-,131**	1			
13. Currently in fulltime education	-,298***	-,117**	,196***	,128**	,095*	0,02	,091*	,131**	,223***	,260***	0,022	-,485***	1		
14. Children	-0,006	-0,009	-0,026	-,116**	-0,007	-0,027	-0,019	-,122**	-,161***	-,244***	0,039	,355***	-,301***	1	
15. Female	-0,03	0,021	,083*	0,025	0,008	-0,041	-0,007	-0,02	-,103*	-0,06	-0,058	-0,002	-0,051	,111**	1

Note: *** p<0,001; ** p<0,01; * p<0,05.

Note: N=610

Logistic regression analysis

The next chapter shows the analysis of the logistic regressions. T4 shows M1-M2, T5 shows M1 and M3-M7, T6 shows M1 and M8-M11, and M7 shows M12-M15. M1 is repeatedly shown in T4-T6 because it is compared to multiple models. The Omnibus Test of Model coefficients measures the significance of the models: every model is significant (p<0,001). The Nagelkerke R² measures the pseudo-R² ranging between 0-1. The closer the pseudo-R² is to 1, the more plausible the model is and the better it fits the data (IBM, 2021). The results show how much each variable reduces/increases the odds of being employed in 2013 compared to a reference category. Every time a reduction/increase in the odds is described, this refers to the odds of being employed in 2013.

H1: Social ties (T4; M1)

More frequent contact with friends and neighbours respectively reduce the odds (of being employed in 2013) by 4% ((1-0,96)*100) and 8,1% ((1-0,919)*100) compared to less frequent contact. More frequent contact with family and colleagues/students respectively increase the odds by 4,2% (1,042) and 30,2% (1,302; p<0,001) compared to less frequent contact. Only the last effect is significant. Thus, the chance that the first three effects are errors is more than 5%. H1 is only partly confirmed: only more frequent contact with colleagues/students positively affects youths' employment status in 2013, but more frequent contact with family, friends and neighbours does not affect youths' employment status in 2013. The pseudo-R² of M1 is 0,251.

H2: Previous employment and lost generation (T4; M1)

Compared to employment in 2008-2010, inactivity and unemployment respectively reduce the odds by 54,4% ((1-0,456)*100; p<0,01) and 54,6% ((1-0,454*100; p<0,01). Both effects are significant. H2 is confirmed: inactivity and unemployment in 2008-2010 negatively affect youths' employment status in 2013 versus employment in 2008-2010.

H3.1: Volunteering (T4; M1)

Volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 respectively increases the odds by 13,2% (1,132) and 3,8% (1,038) compared to non-volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013. Both effects are non-significant, so the chance that they are errors is more than 5%. H3.1 is not confirmed: volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 does not affect youths' employment status in 2013 versus non-volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013.

H3.2: Volunteering as a pathway to employment for inactive and unemployed youths (T4; M2) The effects of the independent variables in M2 are not analysed because the effects of all variables change when adding interaction variables. Compared to non-volunteering employed youths in 2008-2010, non-volunteering inactive youths reduce the odds by 43,8% ((1-0,562)*100; p<0,05). The negative effects of volunteering inactive youths (0,518), nonvolunteering unemployed youths (0,522), volunteering unemployed youths (0,595), and the positive effect of volunteering employed youths (1,451) are non-significant. Thus, the effects are interpreted as no difference and volunteering inactive youths in 2008-2010 do not differ from non-volunteering and volunteering unemployed and employed youths in 2008-2010 show a negative effect on employment in 2013. The pseudo-R² of M2 is 0,255, slightly larger than M1, so M2 fits the data better. H3.2 is partly confirmed: volunteering in 2008-2010 weakens the negative effect of inactive youths in 2008-2010 on employment status in 2013. Volunteering in 2008-2010 does not weaken the negative effect of unemployed youths in 2008-2010 on employment status in 2013.

Table 4: Logistic regression	on M1-M2			
	M1		M2	
	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.
Educational attainment	1,122*	0,056	1,118*	0,057
SGI from Turkey or Morocco	0,684	0,233	0,669	0,235
Social ties				
Frequency of contact with family	1,042	0,088	1,032	0,088
Frequency of contact with friends	0,96	0,122	0,963	0,122
Frequency of contact with colleagues/students	1,302***	0,063	1,309***	0,064
Frequency of contact with neighbours	0,919	0,059	0,922	0,059
Employment status in 2008-2010				
Inactive in 2008-2010	0,456**	0,241	0,562*	0,287
Unemployed in 2008-2010	0,454*	0,309	0,522	0,355
Volunteering				
Volunteering in 2008-2010	1,132	0,242	1,451	0,305
Volunteering in 2013	1,038	0,236	1,011	0,237
Inactive 2008-2010*Volunteering 2008-2010			0,518	0,497
Unemployed 2008-2010*Volunteering 2008-2010			0,595	0,714
Age	1,042	0,052	1,045	0,052
Currently in fulltime education	0,207***	0,25	0,209***	0,251
Children	0,5*	0,347	0,491*	0,349
Female	0,898	0,203	0,932	0,205
Constant	1,223	1,43	1,059	1,436
Pseudo R ²	0,251		0,255	
Ν	610		610	

Note: All models are significant on the p<0,001 level.

Note: *** p<0,001; ** p<0,01; * p<0,05.

H4.1: Educational inequality (T5; M1 & M3)

One increase in educational level increases the odds in M3 (only including educational attainment) and M1 (including all independent variables) respectively by 16% (1,16; p<0,01) and 12,2% (1,112; p<0,05). Controlling for all independent variables decreases the positive effect of educational attainment by 3,8 percentage points. The pseudo-R² of M3 is smaller than M1 (0,17): M1 fits the data better than M3. H4.1 is confirmed: having a higher obtained level of education positively affects youths' employment status versus having obtained a lower level of education.

H4.2: Social network and its' relation to educational inequality (T5; M4-M7)

For contact with family (M4): compared to low-educated youths without contact, the negative effects of high-educated youths without contact (0,947), low-educated youths with more contact (0,946), and the positive effect of high-educated youths with more contact (1,035) are non-significant. This is interpreted as no difference in the effect of the frequency of contact with family on employment status by educational attainment.

For contact with friends (M5): compared to low-educated youths without contact, the negative effects of high-educated youths without contact (0,862), low-educated youths with more contact (0,831), and the positive effect of high-educated youths with more contact (1,054) are non-significant. This is interpreted as no difference in the effect of the frequency of contact with friends on employment status by educational attainment.

For contact with colleagues/students (M6): compared to low-educated youths without contact, high-educated youths without contact increase the odds by 26,2% (1,262; p<0,05), and low-educated youths with more contact increase the odds by 41,3% (1,413; p<0,001). The negative effect of high-educated youths with more contact (0,968) is non-significant. Thus, having more contact with colleagues/students positively affects low-educated youths' employment status while negatively affecting high-educated youths' employment status.

For contact with neighbours (M7): compared to low-educated youths without contact, low-educated youths with more contact reduce the odds by 22,1% ((1-0,779)*100; p<0,05), and high-educated youths with more contact increase the odds by 5,7% (1,057; p<0,05). The negative effect of high-educated youths without contact (0,918) is non-significant. Thus, having more contact with neighbours negatively affects low-educated youths' employment status while positively affecting high-educated youths' employment status. The pseudo-R² M7 (0,259) is greatest, followed by M6 (0,254), and M4-M5 (0,253). Which are all bigger than M1 and M3.

H4.2 is only partly confirmed. The effect of having more contact with family and friends is not stronger for high-educated youths. It still does not affect employment status when differentiating by educational attainment. The positive effect of having more contact with colleagues/students is not stronger for high-educated youths. It is negative while positive for low-educated youths. Only the positive effect of having more contact with neighbours is stronger for high-educated youths.

	Tab	le 5: Logis	tic regressi	on M1	& M3-M7							
	M1		M3		M4		M5		M6		M7	
	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.
Educational attainment	1,122*	0,056	1,16**	0,053	0,947	0,213	0,862	0,281	1,262*	0,11	0,918	0,113
SGI from Turkey or Morocco	0,684	0,233			0,677	0,234	0,681	0,234	0,683	0,233	0,685	0,234
Social ties												
Frequency of contact with family	1,042	0,088			0,946	0,146	1,036	0,088	1,042	0,088	1,033	0,088
Frequency of contact with friends	0,96	0,122			0,955	0,122	0,831	0,196	0,971	0,122	0,986	0,123
Frequency of contact with colleagues/students	1,302***	0,063			1,305***	0,063	1,303***	0,063	1,413***	0,091	1,306***	0,063
Frequency of contact with neighbours	0,919	0,059			0,918	0,059	0,923	0,059	0,92	0,059	0,779*	0,102
Employment status in 2008-2010												
Inactive in 2008-2010	0,456**	0,241			0,461**	0,241	0,448**	0,242	0,471**	0,243	0,456**	0,242
Unemployed in 2008-2010	0,454*	0,309			0,446**	0,31	0,451*	0,309	0,468*	0,31	0,435**	0,311
Volunteering												
Volunteering in 2008-2010	1,132	0,242			1,154	0,243	1,146	0,242	1,095	0,242	1,16	0,243
Volunteering in 2013	1,038	0,236			1,033	0,235	1,012	0,237	1,058	0,236	0,995	0,238
Education*family					1,035	0,042						
Education*friends							1,054	0,055				
Education*colleagues/students									0,968	0,026		
Education*neighbours											1,057*	0,027
Age	1,042	0,052	1,072	0,048	1,045	0,052	1,04	0,052	1,044	0,052	1,052	0,052
Currently in fulltime education	0,207***	0,25	0,254***	0,228	0,207***	0,25	0,203***	0,251	0,204***	0,251	0,208***	0,251
Children	0,5*	0,347	0,393**	0,321	0,499*	0,347	0,511	0,348	0,495*	0,351	0,504	0,35
Female	0,898	0,203	0,855	0,192	0,895	0,203	0,891	0,203	0,898	0,203	0,906	0,204
Constant	1,223	1,43	0,741	1,127	1,881	1,522	2,764	1,669	0,82	1,47	1,669	1,454
Pseudo R ²	0,251		0,17		0,253		0,253		0,254		0,259	
N	610		610		610		610		610		610	

Note: All models are significant on the p<0,001 level.

Note: *** p<0,001; ** p<0,01; * p<0,05.

H5.1 and H5.2: Ethnic penalty for second-generation immigrants from Turkey or Morocco (T6; M1, M8-M9)

Being SGI reduces the odds in M8 (only including SGI) and M1 (including all independent variables) respectively by 43,7% ((1-0,563)*100; p<0,01) and 31,6% ((1-0,684)*100) compared to natives. The effect of M1 is non-significant, which is interpreted as no effect. The pseudo-R² of M8 (0,171) is smaller than M1. H5.1 is partly confirmed: when treated in isolation, being SGI negatively affects youths' employment status compared to natives. However, when controlling for educational attainment, social ties, previous employment status, and volunteering, SGIs and natives do not differ in employment status.

When only including educational attainment and immigrant status in M9, the negative effect of SGIs is slightly reduced by two percentage points compared to M3. SGIs reduce the

odds by 41,7% ((1-0,583)*100; p<0,01), while this was 43,7% in M3. The pseudo- R^2 of M9 (0,185) is bigger than M8 but smaller than M1. H5.2 is partly confirmed: differences in educational attainment only slightly explain the negative effect of SGIs from Turkey or Morocco on employment status versus natives. However, the explained difference by educational attainment is so tiny that it is negligible. This is not in line with H5.2.

H6.1 and H6.2: Previous employment, volunteering, and the relation to educational- and ethnic inequality (T6; M10-M11)

Compared to M9, the positive effect of educational attainment is slightly reduced by 0,6 percentage points from 15% (1,15; p<0,01) to 14,4% (1,144; p<0,05) when including employment status in 2008-2010 in M10. The explained difference is so tiny that it is negligible. The negative effect of SGIs is reduced by 13,4 percentage points and non-significant when including employment status in 2008-2010, while it reduced the odds by 41,7% in M9. The pseudo-R² of M10 is 0,212, which is greater than M8-M9 but smaller than M1.

H6.1 is partly confirmed: differences in employment status in 2008-2010 do not explain the positive effect of educational attainment on youths' employment status in 2013, but it does explain the total negative effect of SGIs on employment status in 2013.

Compared to M9, the positive effect of educational attainment is reduced by 0,3 percentage points from 15% (p<0,01) to 14,7% (1,147; p<0,05) when including volunteering in M11. The negative effect of SGIs is reduced by one percentage point from 41,7% (p<0,01) to 40,7% ((1-0,593)*100; p<0,05) when including volunteering. The explained difference in effects is so tiny that it is negligible. H6.2 is not confirmed: differences in volunteering do not explain the positive effect of educational attainment and the negative effect of SGIs on employment status in 2013. The pseudo-R² of M11 is 0,185, the same as M9, greater than M8 but smaller than M1 and M10.

	Table 6: L	ogistic 1	egression 1	M1 & M	I8-M11					
	M1		M8		M9		M10		M11	
	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.
Educational attainment	1,122*	0,056			1,15**	0,054	1,144*	0,054	1,147*	0,054
SGI from Turkey or Morocco	0,684	0,233	0,563**	0,202	0,583**	0,203	0,717	0,213	0,593*	0,208
Social ties										
Frequency of contact with family	1,042	0,088								
Frequency of contact with friends	0,96	0,122								
Frequency of contact with colleagues/students	1,302***	0,063								
Frequency of contact with neighbours	0,919	0,059								
Employment status in 2008-2010										
Inactive in 2008-2010	0,456**	0,241					0,473**	0,235		
Unemployed in 2008-2010	0,454*	0,309					0,443**	0,299		
Volunteering										
Volunteering in 2008-2010	1,132	0,242							1,063	0,231
Volunteering in 2013	1,038	0,236							1,036	0,225
Age	1,042	0,052	1,114*	0,045	1,064	0,049	1,034	0,05	1,064	0,049
Currently in fulltime education	0,207***	0,25	0,288***	0,226	0,272***	0,23	0,266***	0,233	0,269***	0,232
Children	0,5*	0,347	0,358**	0,319	0,4**	0,323	0,383**	0,33	0,401**	0,324
Female	0,898	0,203	0,917	0,192	0,897	0,194	0,889	0,197	0,898	0,194
Constant	1,223	1,43	0,516	1,102	1,008	1,143	2,584	1,19	0,993	1,147
Pseudo R ²	0,251		0,171		0,185		0,212		0,185	
N	610		610		610		610		610	

H7.1: Volunteering as informal qualification & job-search strategy for low-educated youths (T7; M12-M13)

For volunteering in 2008-2010 and education (M12): compared to low-educated non-volunteers, the positive effects of high-educated non-volunteers (1,125), low-educated volunteers (1,16), and the negative effect of high-educated volunteers (0,992) are non-significant. This is interpreted as no difference in the effect of volunteering in 2008-2010 on employment status in 2013 by educational attainment.

For volunteering in 2013 and education (M13): compared to low-educated non-volunteers, high-educated non-volunteers increase the odds by 16,1% (1,161; p<0,05). The positive effect of low-educated volunteers (1,477) and negative effect of high-educated volunteers (0,889) are non-significant. Thus, volunteering in 2013 negatively affects high-educated youths' employment status in 2013, while it does not affect low-educated youths' employment status in 2013, while it does not affect low-educated youths' employment status in 2013. H7.1 is not confirmed: low educational attainment does not strengthen the positive effect of volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013. Higher educational attainment also does not strengthen the positive effect of volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013, but the effect of volunteering in 2013 is negative for high-educated youths.

H7.2: Volunteering as bridging social ties and integration signal (T7: M14-M15)

For volunteering in 2008-2010 and immigrant status (M14): compared to native non-volunteers, the negative effects of SGI non-volunteers (0,614), native volunteers (0,994), and the positive effect of SGI volunteers (1,7) are non-significant. For volunteering in 2013 and immigrant status (M15): compared to native non-volunteers, the negative effects of SGI non-volunteers (0,688), SGI volunteers (0,976), and the positive effect of native volunteers (1,046) are non-significant. This is interpreted as no difference in the effect of volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 for natives and SGIs. Hypothesis 7.2 is not confirmed: being SGI from Turkey or Morocco does not strengthen the positive effect of volunteering on youths' employment status in 2013.

Table 7: I	ogistic reg	ression	M12-M15					
	M12		M13		M14		M15	
	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.
Educational attainment	1,125	0,067	1,161*	0,066	1,13*	0,057	1,122*	0,056
SGI from Turkey or Morocco	0,683	0,233	0,689	0,233	0,614	0,258	0,688	0,264
Social ties	2	5	·	2	, ,	-	- -	5
Frequency of contact with family	1,041	0,088	1,036	0,088	1,04	0,088	1,042	0,088
Frequency of contact with friends	0,961	0,122	0,971	0,123	0,96	0,122	0,96	0,122
Frequency of contact with colleagues/students	1,302***	0,063	1,302***	0,063	1,303***	0,063	1,302***	0,063
Frequency of contact with neighbours	0,919	0,059	0,922	0,059	0,92	0,059	0,919	0,059
Employment status in 2008-2010								
Inactive in 2008-2010	0,456**	0,241	0,44**	0,245	0,45**	0,242	0,457**	0,242
Unemployed in 2008-2010	0,454*	0,309	0,453*	0,31	0,464*	0,31	0,453*	0,309
Volunteering								
Volunteering in 2008-2010	1,16	0,415	1,13	0,242	0,994	0,274	1,13	0,244
Volunteering in 2013	1,037	0,236	1,477	0,42	1,057	0,236	1,046	0,279
Volunteering 2008-2010*Education 2013	0,992	0,113						
Volunteering 2013*Education 2013			0,889	0,116				
Volunteering 2008-2010*Immigrant					1,7	0,537		
Volunteering 2013*Immigrant							0,976	0,47
Age	1,042	0,052	1,045	0,052	1,038	0,052	1,042	0,052
Currently in fulltime education	0,207***	0,25	0,208***	0,25	0,204***	0,251	0,208***	0,25
Children	0,501*	0,348	0,504*	0,348	0,503*	0,347	0,5*	0,348
Female	0,897	0,203	0,885	0,204	0,874	0,205	0,898	0,203
Constant	1,217	1,432	1,016	1,44	1,393	1,439	1,215	1,435
Pseudo R ²	0,251		0,253		0,253		0,251	
N	610		610		610		610	

Note: All models are significant on the p<0,001 level. Note: *** p<0,001; ** p<0,01; * p<0,05.

Note: p<0,001; p<0,001; p<0,01; p<0,05.

Control variables

The effects of control variables are only analysed for the models without interaction variables. The effects of all control variables are in the expected direction in all models. Only the effects of currently being in education and having children are significantly negative in all models. Being female and age do not significantly affect youths' employment status in 2013.

Sensitivity analysis

The categories of the variables on social ties are not evenly distributed. The sensitivity analysis examines whether recoding these variables changes the results. The items are recoded, ranging from 0-3 (less than once a month-(almost) every day), while this was 0-6. The sensitivity analysis repeats M1 and M4-M7 using the new variables (see Appendix T1).

Repeating the models changes the strength of some effects but does not influence any conclusions. However, when checking the assumption of linearity to the log odds, contact with colleagues/students, neighbours, and their interaction variables ranging from 0-6 showed non-linearity. When rechecking this assumption with a range from 0-3, the variables on neighbours still show non-linearity, but the variables on colleagues/students are linearly related to the log odds. While previous research used the variables on social capital with a range of seven categories, they had a different research population (Tubergen & Volker, 2015). The distribution of respondents over the categories shows few respondents in the lowest contact frequency categories. Changing the variables to a 0-3 range better fits this research population.

The variable on age was also not linearly related to the log odds. Therefore, M1 is repeated with two dummy variables on age: 23-26 and 27-30 (ref.: 19-22) to examine whether the effect on employment status differs by category (see Appendix T2). M1A and M1B respectively include social ties variables with the 0-6 and 0-3 range. In both variants, the effects of age do not differ per category. In M1A, the results are not substantially changed, but in M1B, the negative effect of the frequency of contact with neighbours becomes significant (0,802; p<0,05). When changing the variables age and social ties, the conclusion on contact with neighbours is changed, but H1 is still only partly confirmed: having more frequent contact with neighbours negatively affects youths' employment status in 2013, which is not in line with H1. Only having more frequent contact with colleagues/students positively affects youths' employment status in 2013.

Conclusion and discussion

Previous research on employment showed the importance of social ties (Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Strauß, 2008; Brook, 2005; Solga, 2008) and the possible benefits from volunteering (Baert & Vujić, 2018; Garrouste et al., 2010; Strauß, 2008), but did not examine this for youths. In literature, youths' employment status is vulnerable during crisis, and previous employment is a crucial factor (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013; Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Parola, 2020; Kerckhoff, 2002; Schoon & Bynner, 2019; Becker, 1975; Brucker, 2015; Brook, 2005; Paul & Batinic, 2009). Furthermore, being low-educated and SGI

from Turkey or Morocco increases the vulnerability (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Hannan et al., 1995; Shavit & Muller, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste et al., 2010; Temple, 2000; Gracia et al., 2014; Tesser & Dronkers, 2007). Using data from two waves of the NELLS (de Graaf et al., 2010; Tolsma et al., 2014), this research contributed to the literature by integrating these concepts. Aiming to give policy advice to prevent a low youth employment rate during the Covid-19 crisis, especially for low-educated and SGI youths.

The first conclusion is that inactivity and unemployment in 2008-2010 negatively affected youths' employment chances three to five years later in 2013. This was the case for youths in general, but SGIs from Turkey or Morocco experienced a disadvantage in employment chances in 2013 compared to natives, which is totally explained by their disadvantage in 2008-2010. Low-educated youths experienced a disadvantage in 2013, which cannot be explained by inactivity/unemployment in 2008-2010. Subsequently, differences in educational attainment cannot explain the disadvantage of SGIs from Turkey or Morocco.

This conclusion supports the lost generation argument (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013), the educational inequality argument (Solga, 2008), and the ethnic penalty argument (van Tubergen & van de Werfhorst, 2007; Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Gracia et al., 2014). Firstly, meaning that inactivity/unemployment at the beginning of the financial crisis affected youths' employment chances later in life, increasing the risk of a lost generation due to scarring effects of inactivity/unemployment (Scarpetta et al., 2010; Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013). Additionally, this had especially detrimental consequences for SGI youths from Turkey or Morocco.

Secondly, the conclusion implicates that educational attainment is a more crucial factor for determining employment chances for youths in general than previous employment status, which is in line with human capital theory (Becker, 1975) and the idea that employers hire employees based on educational qualifications (Gracia et al., 2014). Theory explains that higheducated youths displace low-educated youths, employers negatively value low-educated youths' skills, and low-educated youths are stigmatised (Solga, 2008). This research does not directly test the mechanisms. However, the mechanisms are plausible considering low labour demand and educational expansion. The interpretation is that high-educated youths were better able to find a job at the end of the financial crisis than low-educated youths, which is in line with previous research (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Ianelli & Duta, 2018; Hannan et al., 1995; Shavit & Muller, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste et al., 2010).

Thirdly, despite the cruciality of education, educational attainment is not necessarily beneficial for SGI youths from Turkey or Morocco. In 2016, 40% of Turkish and Moroccan

SGIs were enrolled in a higher-vocational or university study (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2016; Rezai, 2017). This was 5% in 1998 (Crul & Doomernik, 2003). Thus, despite SGIs upwards mobilisation in educational attainment (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2016, 2020a; Rezai, 2017; Crul & Doomernik, 2003), they are disadvantaged in employment. While Gracia et al. (2014) found that controlling for educational attainment strengthened the disadvantage for SGIs in 2008-2010, this is not found for the youngest cohort. However, the upward mobilisation does not decrease the ethnic penalty, while inactivity and unemployment in 2008-2010 were detrimental for SGIs from Turkey or Morocco. This indicates discrimination and stigmatisation. Jacobs & Rea (2009) support this: the Netherlands introduced the term "allochtone" as a term for people of whom one or both parents were born outside of the Netherlands, but it became negatively connotated and focused on non-Western "others" to pinpoint, among other groups, Turkish and Moroccan immigrants (Ibid.). The negative connotation implicates stigmatisation.

The second conclusion is that contact with colleagues or fellow students positively affects youths' employment chances, but more contact with neighbours negatively affects employment chances. Additionally, contact with neighbours positively affects employment chances for high-educated youths, but negatively for low-educated youths. In contrast, contact with colleagues/students positively affects employment chances for low-educated youths, but negatively for high-educated youths. Lastly, contact with family and friends does not affect employment chances and does not differ by educational attainment.

This conclusion partly supports the social ties argument and one education mechanism: the impoverished network resources argument. Firstly, this implicates that social ties provide information, influence (Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Strauß, 2008) and support (Brook, 2005) which increase employment chances, but social ties are not beneficial in all circumstances. The value of the tie is crucial (Strauß, 2008), not only the contact frequency. Low-educated youths have fewer valuable resources for employment (Solga, 2008) in their neighbourhood than high-educated youths. Picard & Zenou (2018) support this. They find spatial segregation of minority-majority groups in urban cities and that minority groups have fewer resources to travel and enhance their social network besides their community (Ibid.). While Picard & Zenou (2018) focused on ethnic segregation, this research implicates that low-educated youths contact neighbours who are part of the minority group and that this is not beneficial for finding employment.

Secondly, the contrasting results for colleagues/students can indicate that high-educated youths have fewer valuable ties with colleagues/students than low-educated youths, but this contradicts theory (Solga, 2008). A more likely implication is that low-educated youths leave education earlier than high-educated youths (Kerckhoff, 2002) and therefore contact more colleagues. Furthermore, high-educated youths are in education until an older age (Ibid.) and contact more fellow students. Subsequently, because they are currently in education, they are less likely to be employed. There can be interpreted that colleagues/students have valuable resources for employment (Strauß, 2008; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993; Lancee, 2012; Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009), but it is also possible that employment indicates more engagement (Brook, 2005) and enhances the possibility for more contacts with colleagues and fellow students (Lancee, 2012). However, employment in 2013 and the contact frequency with colleagues/students are not related when in isolation of other factors.

Thirdly, the contrasting results for family and friends can indicate that these categories are not valuable for employment, but this is not likely. Primarily family and friends are expected to be strong ties providing support (Granovetter, 1983; Brook, 2005). There are minor differences in contacts with family and friends within the dataset, explaining the lack of power in the results and the discrepancy with theory.

The third conclusion is that volunteering at the beginning of the financial crisis only enhanced employment chances for inactive youths, not for unemployed youths. Additionally, for youths in general, volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 did not affect employment chances in 2013. For both low-educated and SGI youths from Turkey or Morocco, volunteering explained a small but negligible part of their disadvantage. Volunteering in 2013 negatively affected high-educated youths' employment chances in 2013, while it did not affect loweducated youths' employment chances. Volunteering in 2008-2010 did not differently affect employment chances in 2013 by education. Furthermore, volunteering in 2008-2010 and 2013 did not differently affect employment chances for SGIs from Turkey or Morocco and natives. Thus, volunteering is not necessarily beneficial for employment chances for everyone.

Firstly, the conclusion supports the pathway to employment argument for inactive but not for unemployed youths. This implies that volunteering reduces the risk of labour market exclusion for inactive youths at the beginning of the financial crisis, explained by increased social engagement (Brook, 2005; Wiertz, 2016), human capital (Strauß, 2008; Kamerade & Ellis Paine, 2014), and self-confidence (Kampen, Elshout & Tonkens, 2013; Kampen & Tonkens, 2019). Another possibility is that inactive youths, on average, invest more time in volunteering than unemployed and employed youths and therefore gain more resources. Van Ingen & Dekker (2011) support this possibility: inactive people more often volunteer than employed or unemployed due to time availability.

Secondly, the conclusion does not support the argument that volunteering increases employment chances by increasing human and social capital that align with employer preferences (Baert & Vujić, 2018) for youths in general. The operationalisation of volunteering can explain this. This research does not differentiate by volunteering type and only measures volunteering at two points in time. Strauß (2008) found that volunteering in organisations dominated by high-educated and employed volunteers is most helpful for job-searching. Furthermore, maybe one volunteered (not) at the survey moment(s) but (not) before or in between. However, this is also the case for previous employment, which still shows an effect. Another possibility is that volunteering is not valuable as qualification or job-search method and work experience and education are more critical in the Netherlands (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2020b). Strauß (2008) supports this: volunteering is more important for employment chances in Great Britain than in Germany, and generous unemployment benefits for Germans enable a lengthy formal job-search based on certified qualifications (Strauß, 2008). The Netherlands has more generous unemployment benefits than Germany and the United Kingdom regarding the percentage of the previous in-work income (OECD, 2021b). This can explain why volunteering does not affect employment chances in the Netherlands and why differences in volunteering cannot explain educational- and ethnic inequality.

Thirdly, the conclusion does not confirm that volunteering functions as informal qualification & job-search strategy for low-educated youths. It implicates that low-educated youths within the Netherlands do not perceive informal certifications and job-searches via volunteering to gain employment (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2020b), which was theorised on Germany's non-standard job segment (Strauß, 2008). Furthermore, volunteering at the end of the financial crisis reduced employment chances of high-educated youths. Possibly, high-educated youths decided more often to volunteer in 2013, at the point when unemployment was highest (Eurostat, 2021), than low-educated youths, and therefore, they did not combine volunteering with working. Strauß (2008) supports this: she found that high-educated people are more likely to keep volunteering in times of unemployment. The conclusion also does not confirm that volunteering enhances bridging social ties and integration signals, implicating that volunteering does not enhance SGIs' employment chances. The strong effect of previous employment can explain this, together with the weak effect of volunteering.

This paragraph addresses strengths and limitations of this research. First, most research on youth employment does not examine differences within the youth group (Choudhry et al., 2012; Marelli et al., 2013; Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Parola, 2020; Schoon & Bynner, 2019). This research contributes to the literature by examining the employment chances of vulnerable youths during the financial crisis. Second, this research integrates social ties, previous employment, and volunteering with educational attainment and immigrant status, making it possible to give policy advice based on critical factors for youths in general and different youths. Third, employment status and volunteering activities are measured at two points in time, making it possible to examine the long-term effects of employment and volunteering during the financial crisis.

Concerning limitations, firstly, the questionnaire did not include some questions on volunteering, social ties and employment status that would have been helpful for this research. Future research should differentiate between different types of tasks in volunteering activities, the social ties acquired through volunteering, measure one's volunteering history, measure the value of social ties, and differentiate between unemployment and inactivity at different points in time. Furthermore, the variables on social ties showed operational limitations since the lower frequencies were not frequently answered. Secondly, future research on volunteering should do a systematic literature review on the effectiveness of volunteering as a strategy for increasing employment. The results of this and previous research vary (Kamerade & Ellis Paine, 2014; Strauß, 2008; Wiertz, 2016; Baert & Vujić, 2018; Sauer, 2015; Brook, 2005; Kampen et al., 2013; Kampen & Tonkens, 2019; Baert & Vujić, 2016). Thirdly, future research should examine education mechanisms affecting employment chances. It is impossible to examine this based on the NELLS data (de Graaf et al., 2010; Tolsma et al., 2014) since information on this is missing, which is the case in much research (Gomez-Salvador & Leiner-Killinger, 2008; Ianelli & Duta, 2018; Hannan et al., 1995; Shavit & Muller, 2000; Solga, 2008; Garrouste et al., 2010; van Tubergen & van de Werfhorst, 2007; Kanas & van Tubergen, 2009; Gracia et al., 2014). It may be helpful to look at research measuring the factors that determine educational success (de Graaf et al., 2000). Furthermore, it is expected that educational attainment follows classical axes of social inequality as socioeconomic status, migration, gender, age, and disability, making it essential to consider intersectionality along different axes of social inequality (Gross, Gottburgsen, & Phoenix, 2016). A better understanding of the mechanisms by which education affects labour market outcomes may be beneficial for loweducated youths' employment chances: schools can incorporate beneficial mechanisms to lower educational levels or decrease stigmatisation.

Policy Advice: preventing a reduction in youths' employment chances during the Covid-<u>19 crisis</u>

Taking the financial crisis as example, it is crucial to enhance youths' employment opportunities during the Covid-19 crisis and low labour demand. The Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment is responsible for labour market policy in the Netherlands (Government of the Netherlands, 2021). A recent topic on Covid-19 concerning youth employment shows that conquering youth unemployment/inactivity is a regional task. Regional mobility teams support regions, and regions receive a budget to support youths to work or continue education (Rijksoverheid, 2021b; Rijksoverheid, 2021c). For vulnerable youths in specific, defined as youths without start qualification, graduates of medium vocational education with the vocational training path (mbo-bol), and youths with a non-Western migration background, cooperation between schools and municipalities is requested for providing support to continue learning or find a job (Rijksoverheid, 2021b). Additionally, when non-Western immigrants are discriminated against, measures should be taken by schools and municipalities (Ibid.). Crucial to consider is that restrictions during Covid-19 resulted in social isolation, which caused mental health problems among youths (Rijksoverheid, 2020). This situation differs from the financial crisis and gives extra difficulties for supporting youths. Since December 2020, municipalities received a budget to organise outdoor activities for youths under 18, and projects aimed at vulnerable youths could organise indoor activities (Ibid.). When zooming into one of the regions, and the municipality of Amsterdam in specific, Work and Income has a separate youth department. This department supports youths job-search and going (back) to school, helps with financial problems, and youths can apply for the social assistance benefit (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2021).

This shows that the focus is on stimulating learning in the educational system and providing support in job-searching. Stimulating educational attainment is beneficial for youths, but for some, this is difficult or impossible. Low-educated youths more often have problems in multiple life domains than high-educated youths (Vrooman, Josten & van Echteld. 2016). Furthermore, there will always be youths forming a minority low-educated group. When this group gets smaller, their employment chances deteriorate even more (Ibid.). Therefore, support in job-searching is crucial since unemployment/inactivity has long-term effects in several life domains for youths, especially for SGIs from Turkey and Morocco. Also, educational attainment is not necessarily beneficial for SGI Turks' and Moroccans' employment chances, indicating discrimination. The policy states that measures should be taken when non-Western immigrants are discriminated against (Rijksoverheid, 2021b). While SGIs are part of this

classification, they should not be forgotten. Even though they are born within the Netherlands, they experience discrimination, even more than first-generation immigrants (Yazdiha, 2016). Additionally, social inequality has intersections along several axes besides socioeconomic status and migration (Gross et al., 2016). Experts on social inequality, discrimination and stigmatisation should be included in designing youth employment policy. To not only take measures when discrimination takes place but also to reduce social inequality actively.

Possible measures to reduce social inequality are to increase social ties for loweducated youths with students from several educational programmes. Also important is to examine whether particular neighbourhoods are disproportionately affected by crisis. Since people in disadvantaged neighbourhoods are often primarily locally-oriented (Pinkster, 2007), outreach teams in these neighbourhoods may be beneficial to support youths that want to engage socially and expand their social network. Network events or collaborations in projects for youths with diverse people from different neighbourhoods can be beneficial since diverse contacts provide other information and influence than existing contacts within one's in-group (Lancee, 2012). The association of Dutch municipalities (VNG, 2021) shows an overview of organised youth activities during Covid-19 that can function as example.

A specific project aimed at vulnerable youths is a collaboration between city district East and the organisation A Bunch of Choices: Talents from East (NL: Talenten uit Oost) (A Bunch of Choices, 2020). Aiming to involve youths (18-27) without start qualification through higher vocational education (hbo) graduates without employment, in "playgrounds" in Amsterdam. A playground refers to a voluntary work-/learning place or internship where youths gain experience (Ibid.). It is essential to consider that not every volunteering job necessarily leads to employment (Strauß, 2008). The results of the project can benefit from differentiating between types of youths. Volunteering, on average, does not lead to employment for unemployed youths. They may benefit from coaching and training concerning jobsearching methods and soft skills employers need (Kamerade & Ellis Paine, 2014) instead of volunteering. In contrast, volunteering can be a pathway to employment for inactive youths, and it remains crucial to consider that some youths are not ready to participate in the labour market or education (Biesma & Bieleman, 2007). For these youths, volunteering can be a daytime activity upgrading their life quality without the ultimate goal of employment. Volunteering can lead to more social engagement (Brook, 2005) and, in the end, social inclusion in labour market participation (Strauß, 2008). When employment is one of several desired outcomes of volunteering projects, it is beneficial to focus on alternative benefits of volunteering and have a realistic expectation of how much volunteering directly contributes to

employment (Kamerade & Ellis Paine, 2014). If the goal of volunteering is to gain employment, volunteering jobs with a high share of high-educated and employed people to expand the social network should be the focus (Strauß, 2008). Most importantly, differences between youths should be considered. A personal approach to youth welfare recipients is essential for activation and long-term participation in the labour market (Bouwman-van 't Veer et al., 2011).

References

- A Bunch of Choices. (2020). *TALENTEN UIT OOST Jongeren uit Amsterdam-Oost richting werk(ervaring) en netwerk.* Amsterdam: A Bunch of Choices.
- Arrow, K. J. (1973). The Theory of Discrimination. In Ashenfelter, O., Rees, A. (eds.), *Discrimination in Labor Markets*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Baert, S. & Vujić, S. (2016). Immigrant Volunteering: A Way Out of Labour Market Discrimination? *Economic letters*, 146, 95-98.
- Baert, S. & Vujić, S. (2018). Does it Pay to Care? Volunteering and Employment Opportunities? *Journal of Population Economics*, 31, 819–836.
- Becker, G. S. (1957). *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, G. S. (1975). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education* (2nd ed.). New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bekkers, R. (2005). Participation in voluntary associations: Relations with resources, personality, and political values. *Political Psychology*, 26, 439–454.
- Biesma, S. & Bieleman, B. (2007). *KWALITATIEF ONDERZOEK NIET-PARTICIPERENDE JONGEREN*. Groningen/Rotterdam: Intraval.
- Borghans, L., Weel, B. ter & Weinberg, B. A. (2008). Interpersonal Styles and Labour Market Outcomes. *Journal of Human Resources*, 43, 815–858.
- Boudon, R. (1974). *Education, Opportunity, and Social Inequality*. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bouwman-van 't Veer, M., Konijn, T. & Berkel, R. van. (2011). Activeren door participeren: De meerwaarde van de Wet maatschappelijke ondersteuning voor re-integratie van mensen in de bijstand. Utrecht: Movisie.

- Brewer, M. B. & Brown, R. J. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (4th ed., pp.554–595). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Brook, K. (2005). Labour market participation: the influence of social capital. *Office for National Statistics: Labour Market Trends*.
- Brown, R. J. (1996). Intergroup relations. In M. Hewstone, W. Stroebe, & G. M. Stephen-son (Eds.), *Introduction to Social Psychology: A European Perspective* (pp. 530–561). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Brucker, D. L. (2015). Social capital, employment and labor force participation among persons with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 43, 17-31.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2016). *Jaarrapport Integratie 2016*. Den Haag: Central Bureau of Statistics.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2020a). *Jaarrapport Integratie* 2020. Den Haag: Central Bureau of Statistics.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2020b). *Vrijwilligerswerk 2019*. Obtained on the 1st of June 2021, via <u>https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/longread/aanvullende-statistische-</u> diensten/2020/vrijwilligerswerk-2019?onepage=true
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2021a). Beroepsbevolking. Obtained on the 24th of April,2021,viahttps://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-

diensten/methoden/begrippen/beroepsbevolking

- Central Bureau of statisctics. (2021b). *Niet-beroepsbevolking*. Obtained on the 24th of March, 2021, via <u>https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-diensten/methoden/begrippen/niet-</u> beroepsbevolking
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2021c). *Arbeidsdeelname; jongeren (15 tot 27 jaar)*. Obtained on the 24th of May 2021, via https://jmopendata.cbs.nl/#/JM/nl/dataset/20175NED/table?dl=324D6.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2021d). *Startkwalificatie (onderwijs)*. Obtained on the 24th of May 2021, via <u>https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-</u> diensten/methoden/begrippen/startkwalificatie-- onderwijs--
- Choudhry, M.T., Marelli, E. & Signorelli, M. (2012). Youth unemployment rate and impact of financial crises. *International Journal of Manpower*, 33(1), 76-95.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95-S120.

- Crul, M & Doomernik, J. (2003). The Turkish and Moroccan Second Generation in the Netherlands: Divergent Trends between and Polarization within the Two Groups. *The International Migration Review*, 37(4), 1039-1064.
- De Nederlandsche Bank. (2021). Jongeren incasseren hardste klappen op de arbeidsmarkt. Obtained on the 28th of May 2021, via <u>https://www.dnb.nl/actueel/algemeen-</u>nieuws/dnbulletin-2021/jongeren-incasseren-hardste-klappen-op-de-arbeidsmarkt/.
- Driessen, G. & Smit, F. (2007). Effects of immigrant parents' participation in society on their children's school performance. *Acta Sociologica*, 50(1), 39-56.
- Eurostat. (2021). *Employment and activity by sex and age annual data*. Obtained on the 5th of June 2021, via <u>https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/LFSI_EMP_A_custom_1031372/def</u> ault/table?lang=en
- Falcke, S. (2017). On the move: Analysing immigration determinants and immigration outcomes. Ridderkerk: Ridderprint.
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske,
 & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (4th ed., pp. 357–411). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Garrouste, C., Kozovska, K. & Arjona Perez, E. (2010). Education and Long-Term Unemployment. Ispra: European Commission Joint Research Centre.
- Gemeente Amsterdam. (2021). *Jongerenpunt voor werk en opleiding*. Obtained on the 7th of June 2021, via <u>https://www.amsterdam.nl/werk-inkomen/jongerenpunt/</u>.
- Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gorry, A. (2013). Minimum wages and youth unemployment. *European Economic Review*, 64, 57–75.
- Gomez-Salvador, R. & Leiner-Killinger, N. (2008). An analysis of youth unemployment in the euro area. *ECB Occasional Paper*, 89.
- Government of the Netherlands. (2021). *Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment*. Obtained on the 7th of June 2021, via <u>https://www.government.nl/ministries/ministry-of-social-affairs-and-employment</u>.
- Graaf, N. D. de, Graaf, P. M. de & Kraaykamp, G. (2000). Parental Cultural Capital and Educational Attainment in the Netherlands: A Refinement of the Cultural Capital Perspective. Sociology of Education, 73, 92-111.

- Graaf, P. M. de, Kalmijn, M., Kraaykamp, G. & Monden, C. W. S. (2010). Design and content of the NEtherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELLS). Research report. Tilburg University & Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands.
- Gracia, P., Vazquez, L. & Werfhorst, H. G. van de. (2014). Are Ethnic Minorities Disadvantaged? The Employment Participation and Occupational Status of Moroccan and Turkish Second Generation Migrants in the Netherlands. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Centre for Inequality Studies.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1974) *Getting a job. A study of contacts and careers*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1983). The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited. Sociological Theory, 1, 201-233.
- Gross, C., Gottburgsen, A. & Phoenix, A. (2016). Educational systems and intersectionality.
 In A. Hadjar & C. Gross (eds.), *Education Systems and Inequalities: International Comparisons* (pp. 51-72). Bristol/Chicago: Policy Press.
- Handy, F. & Greenspan, I. (2009). Immigrant Volunteering A Stepping Stone to Integration. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q*, 38, 956–982.
- Hannan, D., Hövels, B., Berg, S. van den & White, M. (1995). 'Early Leavers' from Education and Training in Ireland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. *European Journal of Education*, 30(3), 325-346.
- Heineck, G. (2011): Does it Pay to Be Nice? Personality and Earnings in the United Kingdom. *ILR Review*, 64, 1020–1038.
- IBM. (2021). Pseudo R-Squared Measures. Obtained on the 2nd of May 2021, via <u>https://www.ibm.com/docs/en/spss-statistics/23.0.0?topic=model-pseudo-r-squared-measures</u>.
- Ianelli, C. & Duta, A. (2018). Inequalities in school leavers' labour market outcomes: do school subject choices matter? Oxford Review of Education, 44(1), 56-74.
- Ingen, E. van & Dekker, P. (2011). Changes in the Determinants of Volunteering: Participation and Time Investment Between 1975 and 2005 in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(4), 682-702.
- Jacobs, D. & Rea, A. (2009). "Allochthones" in the Netherlands and Belgium. *International Migration*, 50(6), 42-57.
- Jahoda, M. (1981). Work, employment, and unemployment. Values, theories, and approaches in social research. *American Psychologist*, 36, 184-191.

- Jahoda, M. (1982). *Employment and unemployment: A social-psychological analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Jahoda, M. (1997). Manifest and latent functions. In N. Nicholson (Ed.), *The Blackwell encyclopedic dictionary of organisational psychology* (pp. 317-318). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Kalter, F. & Kogan, I. (2006). Ethnic inequalities at the transition from school to work in Belgium and Spain: Discrimination or self-exclusion? *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 24, 259-274.
- Kamerade, D. & Ellis Paine, A. (2014). Volunteering and employability: implications for policy and practice. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 5(2), 259–73.
- Kampen, T., Elshout, J. & Tonkens, E. (2013). The fragility of self-respect: emotional labour of workfare volunteering. *Social Policy and Society*, 12(3), 427-438.
- Kampen, T. & Tonkens, E. (2019). Empowerment and Disempowerment of Workfare Volunteers: A Diachronic Approach to Activation Policy in the Netherlands. *Social Policy & Society*,18(3), 351–364.
- Kanas, A. & Tubergen, F. van. (2009). The Impact of Origin and Host Country Schooling on the Economic Performance of Immigrants. *Social Forces*, 88(2), 893-916.
- Kerckhoff, A. C. (2002). From student to worker. In J.T. Mortimer & M.J. Shanahan (ed.), *Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research: Handbook of the Life Course* (pp. 251-268). New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lancee, B. (2012). *Immigrant performance in the labour market: bonding and bridging social capital*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Marelli, E. Choudhry, M.T. & Signorelli, M. (2013). Youth and Total Unemployment Rate: The Impact of Policies and Institutions. *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, 121(1), 63-68.
- Moro-Egido, A.I. & Panades, J. (2010). An Analysis of Student Satisfaction: Full-Time vs. Part-Time Students. *Social Indicators Research*, 96(2), 363-378.
- OECD. (2006). Competitive Cities in the Global Economy. Paris: OECD.
- OECD. (2015). Skills for Social Progress. Paris: OECD.
- OECD. (2021a). Youth unemployment rate. Obtained on the 14th of April 2021, via <u>https://data.oecd.org/unemp/youth-unemployment-rate.htm</u>
- OECD. (2021b). *Net replacement rate in unemployment*. Obtained on the 1st of June 2021, via <u>https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=NRR</u>.
- Parola, A. (2020). Novel Coronavirus Outbreak and Career Development: A Narrative

Approach Into the Meaning for Italian University Graduates. Naples: University of Naples.

- Paul, K. I. & Batinic, B. (2009). The need for work: Jahoda's latent functions of employment in a representative sample of the German population. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 45-64.
- Picard, P. M. & Zenou, Y. (2018). Urban spatial structure, employment and social ties. *Journal* of Urban Economics, 104, 77-93.
- Pinkster, F. M. (2007). Localised Social Networks, Socialisation and Social Mobility in a Lowincome Neighbourhood in the Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, 44(13), 2587–2603.
- Portes, A. & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6), 1320-1350.
- Rezai, S. (2017). The Rise of the Second Generation: The role of social capital in the upward mobility of descendants of immigrants from Turkey and Morocco. Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit.
- Rijksoverheid. (2020). Jeugdpakket activiteiten kunnen doorgaan tijdens lockdown. Obtained on the 25th of June 2021, via <u>https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2020/12/18/jeugdpakket-activiteiten-</u> kunnen-doorgaan-tijdens-lockdown.
- Rijksoverheid. (2021a). Maart 2020: Maatregelen tegen verspreiding coronavirus, intelligente lockdown. Obtained on the 5th of June 2021, via https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/coronavirus-tijdlijn/maart-2020maatregelen-tegen-verspreiding-coronavirus.
- Rijksoverheid. (2021b). *Aanpak jeugdwerkloosheid*. Obtained on the 7th of June 2021, via <u>https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/sociaal-pakket/aanpak-jeugdwerkloosheid</u>.
- Rijksoverheid. (2021c). Nieuwe aanpak regionale mobiliteitsteams. Obtained on the 7th of

 June 2021, via
 https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/sociaal

 pakket/begeleiding-van werkloosheid-naar-nieuw-werk/regionale

mobiliteitsteams.

- Sauer, R. M. (2015): Does it Pay for Women to Volunteer? *International Economic Review*, 56, 537–564.
- Scarpetta, S., Sonnet, S. & Manfredi, T. (2010). Rising Youth Unemployment During The Crisis: How to Prevent Negative Long-term Consequences on a Generation? OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, 106.

Schoon, I. & Bynner, J. (2019). Young people and the Great Recession: Variations

in the school-to-work transition in Europe and the United States. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, 10(2), 153-173.

- Shavit, Y. & Muller, W. (2000). Vocational Secondary Education. *European Societies*, 2(1), 29-50.
- Solga, H. (2002). 'Stigmatisation by Negative Selection': Explaining Less-Educated People's Decreasing Employment Opportunities. *European Sociological Review*, 18(2), 159-178.
- Solga, H. (2008). Lack of training. Employment opportunities for low-skilled persons from a sociological and microeconomic perspective. In K. U. Mayer & H. Solga (Eds.), *Skill formation. Interdisciplinary and cross-national perspectives* (pp. 173-204). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sørensen, A. B. (1977). The structure of inequality and the process of attainment. AmericanSociologicalReview,42(6),965–978.
- Sørensen, A. B., & Kalleberg, A. L. (1981). An outline of a theory of matching persons to jobs. In I. Berg (Ed.), *Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets* (pp.49–74). New York: Academic Press.
- Spence, M. A. (1974). *Market Signaling: Informational Transfer in Hiring and Related Screening Processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Statistics Solutions. (2021). Assumptions of Logistic Regression. Obtained on the 14th of April 2021, via <u>https://www.statisticssolutions.com/assumptions-of-logistic-regression/</u>.
- Steinberg, S.A. (2013). The High Cost of Youth Unemployment. Center for American Progress.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (1975). The theory of "screening," education, and the distribution of income. *American Economic Review*, 65(3), 283–300.
- Strauß, S. (2008). Volunteering and Social Inclusion. Interrelations between Unemployment and Civic Engagement in Germany and Great Britain. Wiesbaden: VS Research/GWV Fachverlage GmbH.
- Tan, E. (2014). Human Capital Theory: A Holistic Criticism. Review of Educational Research, 84(3), 411-445.
- Temple, J. (2000). Growth Effects of Education and Social Capital in the OECD Countries. *Historical Social Research*, 27(4), 5-46.

- Tesser, P. & J. Dronkers (2007). Equal opportunities or social closure in the Netherlands. In A.
 F. Heath and S. Y. Cheung (Ed.), *Unequal Chances. Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets* (pp. 359-402). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thurow, L. C. (1975). Generating Inequality. New York: Basic Books.
- Tolsma, J., Kraaykamp, G., de Graaf, P., Kalmijn, M. & Monden, C. (2014). Design and content of the Netherlands longitudinal lifecourse study Nells: codebook panel (wave 1 and wave 2). Nijmegen, Tilburg, Amsterdam: Radboud University Nijmegen, Tilburg University, University of Amsterdam.
- Tubergen, F. & Volker, B. (2015). Inequality in Access to Social Capital in the Netherlands. *Sociology*, 49(3), 521-538.
- Tubergen, F. van & Werfhorst, H. van de. (2007). Postimmigration Investments in Education: a Study of Immigrants in the Netherlands. *Demography*, 44(4), 883-898.
- Vlasblom, J. D. & Schippers, J. (2006). Changing dynamics in female employment around childbirth: evidence from Germany, the Netherlands and the UK. *Work, employment and society*, 20(2), 329-347.
- VNG. (2021). *Praktijkvoorbeelden*. Obtained on the 25th of June 2021, via <u>https://vng.nl/overzicht-</u>

praktijkvoorbeelden?zoeken=%23jongerenincoronatijd&sort_bef_combine=created_ DESC&sort_by=created&sort_order=DESC&page=0.

- Vrooman, J.C., Josten, E. & Echelt, P. van. (2016). De laagopgeleiden van de toekomst: meer dan een scholingsprobleem. In P. Konings & E. Vogels (eds.), *Perspectief op de* onderkant van de arbeidsmarkt (pp. 23 – 40). Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Wial, H. (1991). Getting a good job: Mobility in a segmented labor market. Industrial Relations, 30(3), 396–416.
- Wiertz, D. (2016). Segregation in Civic Life: Ethnic Sorting and Mixing across Voluntary Associations. *American Sociological Review*, 81(4), 800-827.
- WSO. (2021). Financial Banking Crisis 2008 Detailed Overview. Obtained on the 8th of June 2021, via <u>https://www.wallstreetoasis.com/financial-banking-crisis-2008-overview</u>.
- Yazdiha, H. (2016). Exclusion through acculturation? Comparing first- and second-generation European Muslims' perceptions of discrimination across four national contexts. *Ethnic* and Racial Studies, 42(5), 782-800.
- Zach. (2019). A Guide to Multicollinearity & VIF in Regression. Obtained on the 17th of April 2021, via <u>https://www.statology.org/multicollinearity-regression/</u>.

Appendix

Tabl	e 1: Logistic	regress	sion sensitiv	vity ana	lysis 1					
	M1		M4		M5		M6		M7	
	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.
Educational attainment	1,141*	0,056	1,059	0,114	1,068	0,137	1,179*	0,081	0,995	0,082
SGI from Turkey or Morocco	0,692	0,232	0,687	0,233	0,691	0,233	0,691	0,232	0,696	0,234
Social ties										
Frequency of contact with family	1,079	0,107	0,964	0,185	1,075	0,108	1,079	0,107	1,063	0,108
Frequency of contact with friends	1,04	0,141	1,035	0,141	0,947	0,226	1,042	0,141	1,081	0,143
Frequency of contact with colleagues/students	1,365**	0,108	1,372**	0,109	1,367**	0,108	1,466*	0,167	1,364**	0,109
Frequency of contact with neighbours	0,813	0,107	0,813	0,107	0,817	0,107	0,811	0,107	0,6**	0,171
Employment status in 2008-2010										
Inactive in 2008-2010	0,449**	0,239	0,456**	0,24	0,446**	0,24	0,455**	0,24	0,439**	0,24
Unemployed in 2008-2010	0,428**	0,306	0,425**	0,307	0,427**	0,307	0,434**	0,307	0,412**	0,309
Volunteering										
Volunteering in 2008-2010	1,148	0,24	1,166	0,24	1,155	0,24	1,131	0,241	1,182	0,242
Volunteering in 2013	0,988	0,233	0,984	0,233	0,978	0,234	0,996	0,233	0,945	0,235
Education*family			1,039	0,051						
Education*friends					1,033	0,061				
Education*colleagues/students							0,974	0,046		
Education*neighbours									1,121*	0,05
Age	1,038	0,051	1,042	0,052	1,037	0,051	1,038	0,051	1,05	0,052
Currently in fulltime education	0,223***	0,245	0,223***	0,246	0,22***	0,247	0,223***	0,245	0,221***	0,247
Children	0,463*	0,34	0,462*	0,34	0,466*	0,34	0,467*	0,341	0,448*	0,344
Female	0,892	0,202	0,889	0,202	0,887	0,202	0,891	0,202	0,913	0,203
Constant	1,699	1,299	1,978	1,316	2,124	1,366	1,543	1,311	1,854	1,319
Pseudo R ²	0,235		0,237		0,236		0,236		0,246	
N	610		610		610		610		610	

Note: All models are significant on the p<0,001 level.

Note: *** p<0,001; ** p<0,01; * p<0,05.

Table 2: Logistic regression s	ensitivity ana	lysis 2		
	M1A		M1B	
	Odds	s.e.	Odds	s.e.
Educational attainment	1,125*	0,055	1,144*	0,055
SGI from Turkey or Morocco	0,689	0,233	0,699	0,232
Social ties				
Frequency of contact with family	1,042	0,088	1,079	0,108
Frequency of contact with friends	0,975	0,123	1,061	0,142
Frequency of contact with colleagues/students	1,301***	0,063	1,357**	0,108
Frequency of contact with neighbours	0,914	0,06	0,802*	0,108
Employment status				
Inactive in 2008-2010	0,461***	0,24	0,454**	0,238
Unemployed in 2008-2010	0,455*	0,306	0,431**	0,304
Volunteering in 2008-2010	1,155	0,243	1,173	0,241
Volunteering in 2013	1,051	0,236	0,999	0,233
Age				
Age 23-26	1,006	0,237	0,975	0,237
Age 27-30	2,418	0,469	2,362	0,467
Currently in fulltime education	0,210***	0,243	0,226***	0,239
Children	0,466*	0,348	0,43*	0,341
Female	0,889	0,203	0,883	0,202
Constant	2,719	0,705	3,646**	0,43
Pseudo R ²	0,259		0,243	
Ν	610		610	

Note: All models are significant on the p<0,001 level.

Note: *** p<0,001; ** p<0,01; * p<0,05.